DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 391 EC 113 315

AUTHOR Wentling, Tim L.; And Others
TITLE Inservice for Vocational Instructors in Serving Special Needs Students. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Research, Development, and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 78
GRANT G05-76-00081
NOTE 110p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Handicapped Children; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Final Reports

ABSTRACT

The final report documents goals and activities of a 1-year project to evaluate, refine, and disseminate an inservice education plan to help vocational instructors better serve special needs students. Five objectives (including formative evaluation of an inservice course through student feedback and achievement data) are listed, and five major products (including an overview of the inservice course and a description of the teacher educator workshop) are identified. Nearly one-half of the report consists of nine appendixes, including student opinion survey results and reponses to the student evaluation form. (C.)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165391

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Inservice for Vocational Instructors In Serving Special Needs Students

Tim L. Wentling, Terry A. Jensen,
Rocco P. Russo and Laurie M. Peak

The project described in this report was supported by Grant #G05-76J0081 from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Ideas and conclusions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Minnesota Research and Development
Center for Vocational and Technical
Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
July 1978

EC113315

Table of Contents

Page

I. Rationale 1

II. Purpose and Procedure 13

III. Project Products 24

A. Overview of Inservice Course 26

B. List of Students Enrolled in the Course. 29

C. An Evaluation Report of Course Offering. 31

D. An Impact Report of Course Offering 37

E. Description of Teacher Educator Workshop 51

IV. References 54

V. Appendices 56

A. Self-Directed Needs Assessment Instrument. 57

B. Results from the Course Participants' Ratings on the Self-Directed Needs Assessment. 61

C. Student Opinion Survey Form. 64

D. Student Opinion Survey Results, Summer 1977 Course. 67

E. Student Opinion Survey Results, Winter 1978 Course. 71

F. Student Evaluation Form. 75

G. Responses to Student Evaluation Form, Summer 1977 Course. 78

H. Responses to Student Evaluation Form, Winter 1978 Course. 85

I. Impact Questionnaire Form. 93

I. Rationale

Orientation to the Problem

Education for "the good life" has been a basic philosophical tenet in the United States since early times (Young, et al., 1969). The "good life" has been defined differently by various groups over the years, but a commonly held view is that independent, economic viability is basic to the good life for all individuals.

Education leading to an independent career role has been a major part of the educational endeavors in most free societies (Young, et al., 1969, p. 3). Furthermore, individuals living in most free societies have the right to and are expected to work, and contribute to the economic productivity of the commonwealth. British philosopher James Mackintosh has expressed a basic belief of many that: "The wealth of society is its stock of productive labor" (Groves, 1966, p.1).

Maximization of both natural and human resources is a critical in-put factor in the total economic development process. More recently, it has been suggested that sustained and expanded levels of economic productivity are highly dependent upon the maximizing of available human resources. Kenneth Clark (1963) writes that:

> It is now axiomatic that training human intelligence is the most valuable resource of a civilized nation. Like other natural resources, it must be discovered and transformed creatively into its most effective and usable form. (p.144)

When viewed in its broadest context, vocational and career education play an important and critical role in the development of human capital. The variety of occupational competencies and specialized training provided through different types of occupational education has often been described as providing the trainee with "marketable" skills.

Specific occupational competencies, when combined with the related general and academic elements of education - thereby constituting career education - can lead individuals to productive, satisfying, and meaningful work roles within the socioeconomic system.

Individuals who choose not to or are incapable of contributing to the socioeconomic system are viewed as economic liabilities. Over the years several groups of individuals have come to be viewed as socioeconomic dependents for a variety of reasons. Handicapped individuals, because of their deviation from what is considered normal behavior, physical appearance, or educational attainment, have been devalued by others (Meyerson, 1977). Many times this devaluing occurs, in part, because these individuals are viewed as economic liabilities and as being far less capable than is really the case (Fold, 1972).

Recently, the economic costs associated with this waste of human potential have been brought to the public's attention. Edwin Martin (1971), Associate Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, has expressed the economic liabilities for the school age handicapped population quite clearly.

> Over the next four years 2.5 million handicapped children will be school leavers either by graduation or the drop-out route. Of that number, less than 1 in 4 will be fully employed or going to college. Another 40%, that is, one million handicapped young people, will be underemployed. Another 25% of this population will probably require welfare assistance.
>
> If each of these youngsters is faced with institutionalization as an alternative to public school programming, the cost will be at least $4,000 per year. Over a life-time of 60 years, that is approximately a quarter of a million dollars per student. (p.5)

In the early 1960's, advocates of the handicapped began to impress upon congress the need to reconsider this waste of human potential from both an economic and humanitarian viewpoint. Various pieces of legislation such as the Vocational Rehabilitation Acts, the Developmental Disabilities Act, and the civil rights legislation were enacted in response to the problem. The Vocational Education Act of 1963, however, was the first legislation to specifically charge vocational educators with the responsibility of providing vocational programming for the handicapped. This landmark legislation first identified special needs students as those individuals having academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

"After four years had passed, however, this general legislative charge had produced few new opportunities for handicapped individuals" (Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Section 102.6a). Fifteen percent of the basic grant was to be spent on programs for the disadvantaged, while 10% was to be spent on vocational programs serving the handicapped. The most recent piece of vocational education legislation (PL 94-482) which was signed in October of 1976 increased the financial support for and further emphasizes the need for serving the handicapped and other special needs students.

In addition to legislative emphasis in vocational education, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) has focused efforts on career education. With a supporting rationale that handicapped members of the population can and should become competitive in the job market and contributing members of the community, the BEH has adopted the

following as one of its national goals:

> To assure that every handicapped child who leaves school has had career education training relevant to the job market, meaningful to his career aspirations, and realistic to his fullest potential (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975).

This legislative and federal agency emphasis has been followed closely by an expanded advocacy trend focusing on the rights and education of the handicapped. Gold (1975) notes that this country is now experiencing an unprecedented age of advocacy and awareness. The creation of new governmental agencies, the passage of new state and federal legislation, and numerous successful litigations have created a societal context for the handicapped which is totally different than in any period heretofore. The basic rights of handicapped individuals to education have been supported by the passage of mandatory special education laws in all but approximately six states, and landmark litigations, such as the case involving the Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Citizens (P.A.R.C.) and the State of Pennsylvania. This movement has essentially resulted in numerous and comprehensive requirements for public education agencies to provide services to <u>all</u> school-aged individuals (Gold, 1975).

<u>Observations Related to the Problem</u>

Several observations highlight more specifically the significance and needed scope of the project reported herein.

<u>Legislative mandates have increased and will continue to increase federal activity in vocational and career education (VCE) for the handicapped</u>. Numerous authors have written about the expanded role that the U.S. Office of Education has been mandated to implement from existing

and new legislation. The 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 mandated that states spend at least 10% of their basic grant for vocational education specifically for programs to serve the handicapped. The recently passed Educational Amendments of 1976 (PL 94-482) now mandate that the 10% set aside to be used to finance only 50% of the cost of vocational education for the handicapped. Under this new legislation, 10% of the federal allocation to states for vocational education could reach $88 million by Fiscal Year 1978. With 50-50 state matching, this could generate as much as $176 million specifically for vocational education programs for the handicapped. Currently, approximately $48 million is being expended.

PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, expands the federal role and intent considerably in special education. Individual educational plans for handicapped learners will have to be developed which include prevocational and vocational objectives.

The concept of "least restrictive enviornment," which essentially says that handicapped learners will be served in regular programs to the maximum extent possible, will be considered in serving handicapped learners ages 3-21 in all educational programs including vocational and career programs. PL 94-142 will also provide funds to LEA's to cover the excess costs involved in providing vocational and career education programming to handicapped learners.

Federal regulations for the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 have also recently been rewritten to require employers with federal contracts to establish affirmative action plans for the recruitment, employment, and advancement of handicapped persons. Section 504 has also been add-

ed to this Act, and prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicapped conditions. Under Section 504, any agency or organization receiving HEW federal assistance (including preschool, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary program) must provide assurances that the handicapped are not discriminated against in terms of: facility design and accessibility, recruitment, admissions, assessment and evaluation, health services, social services, non-academic services, and other specific educational practices.

Provisions and funding authorizations have also been legislated for career education. Although the federal funding level has been held at $10 million in the Educational Amendments of 1976, career education has proven to be a viable, dynamic, and growing reform movement in American education that is beginning to have a significant impact on programming for handicapped learners from kindergarten through adult age levels.

Problems have been encountered in implementing the legislative mandates of Congress. The Bureaus of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) and Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE), along with the Office of Career Education (OCE), have the principal responsibilities for implementing the federal efforts in Vocational/Career Education (VCE) for the handicapped. Recent reports by the Government Accounting Office (1974 and 1976) have noted some of the problems. The GAO (1974) Report on the Role of Federal Assistance in Vocational Education found that:

- In FY 1973 14 states spent less than the 10% set aside for vocational education for the handicapped.
- Relatively few handicapped persons are participating in vocational education programs.
- The proportion of handicapped enrollments declined relative

to total enrollments in vocational education from FY 1971 to FY 1973.

The GAO (1976) Report on the Training of Educators for the Handicapped noted that:

> In FY 1974 less than 2% of the 13 million enrollments in vocational education programs were identified handicapped learners.
>
> Approximately 10% of the school-age population have some form handicap.
>
> During FY 1974 less than 500 of the 266,000 vocational education teachers nationwide received inservice training related to teaching the handicapped.
>
> 78% of the vocational administrators surveyed indicated that only a limited number of their staff were sufficiently trained in working with the handicapped.
>
> Although personnel training in VCE for the handicapped is authorized under several Federal programs (EHA-Part D, VEA-Part B, and EPDA-Parts B, D, and F), no major effort has been made to insure that it is provided.

Closer examination of these problems reveals that they are extremely complex. The basic organizational nature of these federal programs is different, which attributed directly to many of the problems. The programs in the BEH are primarily discretionary in nature, and are monitored directly by staff in the Office of Education. The BOAE on the other hand, administers funds to the states on a formula basis. Much of the monitoring of the State Plans for Vocational Education and other vocational education programs occurs in the HEW regional offices.

Minimal staffing in both Bureaus and the OCE limits the extent of direct technical assistance which can be provided to professionals in the field (GAO, 1976). It also appears to limit the extensiveness and effectiveness of coordination efforts between personnel in the BEH, BOAE, and OCE.

Various forms of developmental activity have been initiated. Since the mid-1960's a sizeable number of local, state, and national projects have developed exemplary programs in vocational education for the handicapped. The states of Vermont and Michigan, for example, have made a major effort in developing curriculum materials for VCE for handicapped learners. A number of specific research problems of national interest have also been addressed through projects funded by BOAE and BEH.

As legislative mandates and educational delivery trends have changed, the problems confronting leaders in vocational and career education and special education have changed. Thus, a continuing need for innovative program development, research, and curriculum development, modification, and installation has been recognized. There exists a specific need for further developmental effort to synthesize existing materials and fill voids that exist, thus building a comprehensive teacher education program, both preservice and inservice.

Limited teacher education activities have been initiated. Since the mid-1960's only a few selected activities have been initiated to train leadership personnel and groups charged with the responsibility of implementing the mandates contained in federal legislation. After the passage of the 1968 Amendments of the Vocational Education Act, a National Conference on Vocational Education for Handicapped Persons was held in Pittsburgh in 1969. This conference, along with a small conference series which was held in 1973-74, were the major efforts funded by BOAE prior to 1976. A research needs assessment conference which focused on career education was sponsored by BEH in 1974. Each of these

conferences involved leadership personnel in different roles from the various fields represented, and admirably focused on broad issues facing the field.

In January, 1976, the University of Illinois conducted a 3-day workshop specifically for teacher educators. The unique feature of this workshop was that it brought together ten teams of special and vocational teacher educators for the purpose of sharing their program development efforts with other institutions and at the same time expanding or refining their own training programs. This workshop was replicated in October of 1976 and reached an additional fifteen teacher education institutions or consortia.

The Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children and the University of Alabama are attempting to retrain teacher educators on a regional basis. Project RETOOL, which is in its first year, is currently conducting needs assessment studies on a regional basis to determine the nature of training which special education teacher trainers perceive themselves as needing in the area of career education.

In FY 1975, under the Vocational Education State Systems Program authorized by the Education Professions Development Act, only 10 of the 50 states conducted personnel development projects related to vocational education for handicapped learners. Nearly all of the projects were short term workshops for vocational teachers, aides, or counselors in local secondary districts. Only three of the projects attempted to include administrators or special educators in the training. None of the projects trained personnel employed at the post-secondary level, and none dealt with the preservice preparation of vocational personnel.

The Division of Personnel Preparation of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has funded six special projects and 30 program assistance grants for FY 1976 in the VCE priority area. All but two of the special projects included counselors and administrators in the population to be trained, along with secondary special education personnel. The 30 program assistance grants which were awarded to universities, SEA's and LEA's focus almost exclusively on the preservice or inservice of secondary special education personnel.

As the national knowledge and experience base of the vocational and career education for the handicapped movement expands, there will undoubtedly be a need to continue to provide inservice training.

There is a need for a systematic approach to inservice. There is a critical need for programs designed to prepare personnel to work effectively with handicapped students in all phases of vocational and career education. Such preparation can take place on either a preservice or an inservice basis. Much of the literature focuses upon different needs and approaches in providing personnel training on an inservice basis, which tends to have more of an immediate effect upon increasing the availability of programs and services to special students at all levels.

Young, et al. (1969, pp. 71-72) offers two key ideas regarding the design of inservice programs. First, he urges the use of inservice teams which can concentrate on program development.

> If undertaken creatively, such teams can serve to upgrade personnel and accomplish necessary program changes. Curriculum revisions, program planning, case studies, and other important projects can facilitate inservice education.

Effectively designed inservice approaches can readily identify and fulfill the needs and interests of local personnel.

Second, Young suggests that inservice programs should be coupled with university and college programs. Cooperative inservice programs of this type can provide the often-needed external leadership or facilitator to provide the incentives needed for implementing new ideas and program changes.

Bobbitt (1971) suggests further that the present inservice needs appear to be: 1) to sensitize vocational educators to their responsibility for serving special needs students; 2) to help teachers acquire the attitudes, understandings, and skills needed to effectively teach these students; and 3) to help teachers recognize students within their existing classrooms and provide supportive assistance in improving programs and services for these students.

Inservice programs for teachers of handicapped minority students require an even heavier emphasis on attitude adjustment. Contemporary Research Incorporated (1974) finds that attitudes and expectations of staff toward handicapped minority students enrolled in vocational education programs "...have the greatest impact on student motivation." Inservice training geared to local school needs is sorely needed, and should include: (1) an assessment and understanding of minority student needs, (2) program planning based on student needs, and (3) individualized instruction (Contemporary Research Incorporated, 1974b, p. 176).

Evans (1975) recommends that inservice programs designed to focus on special needs students be expanded beyond short-term efforts which tend to promote only an understanding that a problem exists to include

more long-term programs designed to produce expertise in handling the problems. Numerous brief reports similar to those cited above can be found in the literature to describe short-term, small-scale inservice activities, such as one or two day workshops. For the most part, these activities have been fragmented and focused only on one or two groups of teachers working with specific types of handicapped students, i.e., workshop skills for the mentally retarded.

Inservice efforts have tended to be planned on short notice with little or no thought given to systematic evaluation or reporting of the inservice effectiveness. Consequently, much needs to be done, not only in the area of providing inservice teacher education experiences to assist career educators in working with the handicapped, but also in the development and testing of approaches to providing inservice staff development.

Identification of the Problem

The basic problem resides in the need to provide effective career education programs and services for handicapped learners at the secondary and post-secondary levels. There are a number of societal, demographic, and economic trends which contribute to the problem:

1. Increasing numbers of handicapped learners are being returned to the community and public schools from special institutions. Large numbers of students previously served in special education classes are being mainstreamed in regular secondary programs.

2. Occupational stereotyping of handicapped learners has been predominate in the minds of many educators.

3. Preservice teacher preparation programs have been extremely limited in preparing teachers who are

knowledgeable in both career education and the education of handicapped learners.

4. Greater amounts of resources and services are being created to help the handicapped individual succeed as an independent member of society.

II. Purpose and Procedure

Project Purpose

The purpose of this one year project was to evaluate, refine, and disseminate an inservice education thrust for helping vocational instructors better serve special needs students. The project was also designed to assess the need for additional inservice training for serving special needs students.

Project Objectives

In order to accomplish the purposes of this project, five objectives were developed which when accomplished would fulfill the project purposes. This section of the report presents the five project objectives along with those tasks associated with each of the respective objectives. A short narrative is also included when necessary to clarify the description of the tasks.

OBJECTIVE #1 - To formatively evaluate an inservice course developed in the Spring of 1977 and offered in the Summer of 1977 and Winter of 1978.

Tasks:

1. Preassess entering needs of students.

   This task was accomplished through the administration of a self-rated needs assessment instrument which was developed by L. Allen Phelps and is included in his manual, "Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners: An Inservice Resource Guide", which was used as the primary text for the inservice course.

2. Obtain daily feedback from students.

   Feedback was obtained from the students at the end of each class session for the summer course by asking them the following questions: (a) Do you feel that the topic covered today was of value to you? (b) How would you have changed

the manner in which the topic was covered to improve understanding and usefulness?

3. Assess student achievement of course objectives.

   Assessment of student achievement was based on successful completion of course requirements. For the summer course, students were required to write either one long paper (ten pages) or two shorter papers (five pages each) on topics related to the course, and to complete six inservice experiences from the text. The winter course students were assessed based on completion of nine inservice experiences from the text and a plan for implementing improved services and programs for special needs students within their specific situations.

4. Obtain student feedback on total course.

   In addition to the informal evaluation conducted on a daily basis by the instructor, a formal evaluation for both courses was conducted. The course evaluations consisted of two different assessment techniques. The first consisted of the "Student Opinion Survey" which is used by the Department of Vocational and Technical Education for all courses offered by the Department. The Survey is computer scored and returned to the Department in the form of a computer print-out. The second approach to course evaluation consisted of ten items for which the students were requested to respond in short comment form. The responses were then grouped by item and served to obtain a more complete and accurate evaluation of the inservice course.

OBJECTIVE #2 - To refine the inservice course based upon the formative evaluation.

Tasks:

1. Review evaluative information obtained in Objective #1.

   Evaluate information from Objective #1 was carefully considered by project staff in order to improve the content, manner of presentation, and utility of the course to the vocational educator serving special needs students.

2. Hold periodic meetings with project staff to discuss evaluation results and needed modification to course.

   Informal staff meetings were held on a daily basis for the summer offering to discuss student comments

and feedback concerning the course. Staff meetings were held every week (eleven week course) for the winter course. In addition, staff meetings were held at the end of both courses to discuss the evaluation results and determine those modifications which students and staff considered desirable.

3. Revise course objectives.

   The course objectives seemed to satisfy the needs of the students based on the formative evaluation. Some changes in the amount of emphasis and manner of presentation occurred as a result of the evaluation.

4. Identify content needing expansion or less emphasis.

   Evaluate information from the summer offering resulted in changes to several of the course units. (See Appendices D and G for the course evaluations.)

5. Identify additional learning activities and materials.

   An extensive search was conducted by the project staff to identify additional learning activities and materials which would assist the student and teacher educator. The search included the E.R.I.C. system, state and national educational materials centers, and numerous contacts with professionals involved with vocational education and serving special needs students. In addition, the project staff developed an inservice resource directory to assist teacher educators in conducting inservice and preservice training of this nature. The resource directory entitled "Resource Directory For Teacher Education In Vocational Special Needs" is available through the Minnesota Research and Development Center for Vocational Education at the University of Minnesota and through the E.R.I.C. Document Reproduction Service.

6. Prepare detailed unit outlines.

   Unit outlines were prepared to assist the teacher educator in conducting this particular course. Included with the outline is a reference to overheads, handouts, other instructional materials/aids, sources for materials, instructor resources, equipment needed, and other special arrangments which the teacher educator can use in conducting the course.

Copies of the Instructor's Guide entitled "Introduction Guide for VoEd5-100, Special Topics in Instruction: Serving Students with Special Needs" is available through the Minnesota Research and Development Center for Vocational Education at the University of Minnesota and through the E.R.I.C. Document Reproduction Service.

7. Prepare overhead transparencies to support each unit.

   Appropriate overhead transparency masters were developed for each of the eight units included in the instructor's guide. The overheads were developed and utilized in both offerings of the course. The transparency masters can easily be made into transparencies by using a "Thermofax" or similar process.

8. Assemble teacher background (resource) materials.

   Materials which would assist the instructor to accomplish the unit objectives and provide the instructor with necessary background information were included in the instructor's guide.

9. Assemble student handout materials.

   Those materials which would assist the student to accomplish the unit objectives and clarify the topics covered were included in the instructor's guide.

10. Assemble materials from Tasks 6 through 9 into instructor's guides.

    Project staff organized the instructor's guide into eight units. Each unit contains an introduction, terminal performance objectives, enabling performance objectives, a unit outline, masters for overhead transparencies, teacher background information, and student handout materials.

11. Duplicate 25 copies of the instructor's guide.

    Twenty-five copies of the instructor's guide were duplicated and assembled.

OBJECTIVE #3 - To orient two or three teacher educators to the inservice course so the offering of the course can be extended.

Tasks:

1. Establish the purpose and tentative plan for a teacher educator workshop.

   A staff meeting was called at which the purpose for the teacher educator workshop was established and a tentative agenda was established. The purpose of the workshop was to orient at least two or three teacher educators to the inservice course, and present them with comprehensive instructor's guides which would facilitate the offering of the inservice course.

2. Establish the date and place for the teacher educator workshop.

   The project staff selected Friday, January 13, 1978 as the date for the teacher educator workshop. The location of the workshop was Peik Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

3. Identify and invite teacher educators to the workshop.

   It was decided that all Department of Vocational and Technical Education faculty members at the University of Minnesota be invited to attend the workshop through a departmental memo. Representatives from other Minnesota State Universities were also invited to attend.

4. Prepare a detailed agenda.

   A detailed agenda for the teacher educator workshop was prepared and distributed to those attending the workshop. See page 52.

5. Contact L. Allen Phelps to be workshop presenter.

   Dr. L. Allen Phelps whose text served as the primary text for the course was invited to be a presenter at the workshop. Dr. Phelps attended the workshop and contributed significantly to its success.

6. Conduct the teacher educator workshop.

   The teacher educator workshop was held on Friday, January 13, 1978, in Peik Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. See page 53 for a list of participants.

OBJECTIVE #4 - To evaluate the impact of the inservice course on students.

Project staff felt that in order to measure the impact of the inservice course, it was necessary to measure how many students benefited and just how they benefited from the inservice training received by the instructor. Only the students from the Summer Session, 1977, course offering were contacted since the Winter Quarter, 1978 students had only recently completed the course and did not have sufficient time to implement those changes perceived to be important.

Tasks: 1. Hold staff meetings to discuss information needs.

A series of staff meetings were held to discuss what information was needed in order to assess the impact of the inservice course on the students. After several meetings, several core areas of information were identified.

2. Formulate key questions.

Based on the core areas of information needed, key questions were formulated. These key questions served as the basis for specific item development.

3. Select evaluation methodology.

Three methods of evaluation were selected. Those methods selected included mail-out questionnaire, telephone interview, and personal interview. Only one method of evaluation was utilized for each student.

4. Develop items for the instrument.

Individual items for the instrument were derived from the key questions identified under Task 2 above.

5. Gain feedback on instrument items.

The individual questions or items were discussed.

6. Assemble items to form an instrument.

After the individual items had been clarified and improved, they were assembled into an instrument which served as the basis for all three methods of evaluation used in this portion of the project. (See Appendix I)

7. Locate students who had taken the course.

All students who had taken the inservice course during the summer, 1977, were located in order to evaluate the impact of the inservice course.

8. Administer the instrument to former students.

Having located all of the former students, the evaluation instrument was administered to each of them either by mail-out questionnaire, by telephone interview, or by personal interview.

9. Follow-up non-respondents.

Three of the students who were evaluated by the mail-out questionnaire needed to be contacted one or more times to obtain their responses. Two individuals required additional contact by telephone to obtain their responses.

10. Tabulate the results.

Three staff members were involved in collecting the responses through three different methods. The information was tabulated and is presented in another section of this report.

11. Prepare an impact report.

An impact report was prepared and is included in another section of this project report.

OBJECTIVE #5 - To determine the need for additional inservice in this area.

Tasks: 1. Review relevant literature.

A comprehensive review of literature was conducted including E.R.I.C. computer searches.

2. Develop the instrument.

   Three model formats for inservice needs assessment were selected and developed. The three model formats include: (a) task listing, (b) open-ended competency listing, and (c) problem listing.

3. Mail out the instrument.

   A total of 217 inservice needs assessment instruments were mailed out on May 26, 1978 (69 of each format) to a randomly selected group of vocational educators in the State of Minnesota.

4. Tabulate the responses.

   Responses to the needs assessment instruments were tabulated and are included in an In-Progress Report entitled Minnesota Vocational Special Needs In-Service Needs Assessment dated June 15, 1978.

III. Project Products

This project encompassed a number of different areas related to inservice education and training for vocational instructors who are or will be serving students with special needs. Due to the broad nature of the project, several products resulted from the efforts of project staff. The five products include:

A. Overview of Inservice Course.

B. List of students enrolled in the course.

C. An Evaluation Report of Course Offering.

D. An Impact Report of Course Offering.

E. Description of Teacher Educator Workshop.

Each of the five products will be described separately, but it should be kept in mind that all of the products compliment each other and are an integral part of the overall purposes and objectives of the project.

A. Overview of Inservice Course

During the spring of 1977, a course syllabus was developed and first piloted with the summer 1977 offering of the inservice course. Evaluative information generated from the summer offering assisted greatly in the refinement and expansion of the present course syllabus. Project staff were concerned that teacher educators would have difficulty offering the course with only a syllabus and consequently developed a comprehensive instructor's guide to facilitate the offering of the course by teacher educators and inservice personnel. The instructor's guide contains detailed outlines for each of the topic areas, instructional objectives, masters of overhead transparencies, masters of handouts, teacher resource materials, and information pertaining to availability of instructional aids and materials. Every effort was made to assist the teacher educator in preparation and offering of the inservice course.

Twenty-five copies of the instructor's guide were produced and completed on January 12, 1978. The majority of the guides were distributed at the teacher educator workshop described in another section of this report. The purpose of the instructor's guide and the teacher educator workshop was to prepare and assist vocational/technical teacher educators to offer similar special needs courses, or incorporate materials related to serving special needs students in courses they are presently teaching or are planning to offer in the future.

During the Winter Quarter, 1978, the instructor's guide was utilized and found to be of great value to instructional staff offering the course. Several minor refinements were made to the original instructor's guide

and although it does not contain all the information that a teacher educator might want to include, it does provide a basis from which to plan and offer an inservice course related to serving special needs students.

The instructor's guide is not included in this project report due to length of the guide and reproduction costs. A copy of the instructor's guide is available on a loan basis through the Minnesota Research and Development Center for Vocational Education, University of Minnesota, and will also be available through the E.R.I.C. system (E.R.I.C. Document Reproduction Service). The instructor's guide is based on and is an expression of the text "Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners: an Inservice Resource Guide" by L. Allen Phelps (E.R.I.C. #ED 133-940).

Department of Voc & Tech Education
University of Minnesota

Special Topics in Instruction

SYLLABUS

COURSE TITLE: Special Topics in Instruction: Working With Special Needs Students

COURSE NUMBER:

MEETING TIME:

MEETING PLACE:

INSTRUCTOR:

ASSISTANTS:

REQUIRED HANDBOOK: Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners by Allen Phelps. $5.50 (Make checks payable to the Minnesota Instructional Materials Center.)

TOPICAL OUTLINE:

I. An Overview of Issues Related to Special Needs Learners and Their Instruction

II. Learner Identification and Analysis

III. Cooperative Instructional Arrangements

IV. Instructional Resources

V. Cluster and Content Analysis

VI. Instructional Planning

VII. Instructional Implementation

VIII. Evaluation of Learner Progress

ASSIGNMENTS:

- Complete 9 inservice experiences (from Handbook).
- A plan for implementing change within your program or area of responsibility.

(With regard to inservice experiences, everyone will complete in-service experiences I.1, I.2, and I.3. The selection of six additional inservice experiences will be based upon your Self-Directed Needs Assessment.)

GRADING:

40% - products of inservice experiences and submission of self-check evaluation forms.

40% - plan for change.

20% - class participation.

B. List of Students Enrolled in the Course

Summer Session II, 1977

Jean Anderson
Route 1, Box 215
Deer River, MN 56636

Jim Bailey
1417 Frankson Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55108

Jude Brase
2127 Twin Bluff Road #108
Red Wing, MN 55066

Bob Engberg
1142 Phelps
Red Wing, MN 55066

Marshall Gorney
2574 Vernon Ave. So.
Mpls., MN 55416

Jim Greenan
616 10th Ave. S.E. #304
Mpls., MN 55414

Cheryl Hafften
2636 30th Ave. S.
Mpls., MN 55406

Bob Jaehne
2400 Lindbergh Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343

Scott Anderson
4840 Yorktown Lane N
Plymouth, MN 55442

Dave Kingsbury
930 Monterey Drive
Shore View, MN 55112

Stephen Koepcke
2601 Burd Place
St. Louis Park, MN 55426

Bob Koppes
912 22nd Ave. So. #208
Mpls., MN 55404

Paul M. Kostecki
656 Labore Road
Little Canada, MN 55117

Peter Martens
Route 4
Red Wing, MN 55066

Frank Moosie
721 15th Ave. S.E. #8
Mpls., MN 55414

Offia M. Okoro
1515 So. 4th St.
Mpls., MN 55454

Lilly Otto
508 Indiana Ave. N.
Golden Valley, MN 55422

Charles Remington
6819 5th Ave. So.
Richfield, MN 55423

Rocco Russo
624 4th Ave. S.E. #17
Mpls., MN

Jan Swanson
1104 25th Ave. S.E.
Mpls., MN 55414

Boy Toy
3633 Belden Drive N.E.
St. Anthony Village, MN

Carol Wenker
2819 28th St. E.
Mpls., MN 55406

Winter Quarter, 1978

Florentine M. Anderson
94 8 W. County Road D
St. Paul, MN 55112

Robert E. Christopherson
12558 Irish Ave. N.
Hugo, MN 55038

Marvin H. Haenze
6800 Orchard Ave. N.
Brooklyn Center, MN 55429

Roger L. Hofmeister
1558 LaMotte Drive
Hugo, MN 55038

Terry A. Jensen
1278 Fifield Place
St. Paul, MN 55108

Stephen C. Johnson
8281 Red Oak Drive
Mpls., MN 55418

Michael E. Kronforst
11035, 104th Place
Maple Grove, MN 55369

Raymond T. Lanning
9024 13th Ave. So.
Bloomington, MN 55420

Beda A. Lewis
1317 Galvin Ave.
W. St. Paul, MN 55118

Jean Morgan
1449 Tenth St., N.W. #103
New Brighton, MN 55112

John P. Morrissey
202 South Lexington Pkwy.
St. Paul, MN 55105

Robert E. Nordstrom
835 Ottawa
St. Paul, MN 55107

Douglas E. Olson
1456 Stanford Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55105

Laurie M. Peak
621 5th Ave. S.E. #2
Mpls., MN 55414

Harland V. Ramberg
2033 Sherwood E.
St. Paul, MN 55119

Curtis J. Rehder
841 Norwood St.
Anoka, MN 55303

Gary E. Sachs
977 Oakdale Ave.
W. St. Paul, MN 55118

Raymond A. Sanchez
1104 Humboldt Ave.
W. St. Paul, MN 55118

John A. Soler
5760 N. Lexington
Shoreview, MN 55112

Robert A. Spartz
649 Heinel Drive
Roseville, MN 55113

Dennis A. Stolhanske
3040 Louisiana Ave., No.
Crystal, MN 55427

C. An Evaluation Report of Course Offering

A formative evaluation was conducted for both inservice courses. The first course was offered during the Second Summer Session, 1977 and the other during Winter Quarter, 1978. The evaluation assisted greatly in the development and improvement of the inservice course. The following is a summary of the evaluation of both courses.

Summer, 1977 Course

The summer course had a total enrollment of 23 individuals from throughout the State of Minnesota. On the first day of the course, a "self-directed needs assessment" was conducted to determine the inservice needs of the students. The needs assessment instrument was developed by L. Allen Phelps and is included in his manual, "Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners: An Inservice Resource Guide", which was used as the primary text for the inservice course. The needs assessment is designed to assist the student to select those portions of the resource guide which would be most beneficial and would most effectively meet his or her needs. The needs assessment is designed such that if the student's score for any of the 24 professional tasks is "seven" or greater, it is recommended that the participant review certain topics/ materials and inservice experiences.

The "self-directed needs assessment" forms were collected from all the students and mean was computed for each of the 24 items. It is interesting to note that all of the professional task means were either "six" or "seven". This would tend to indicate that all of the items are of relatively the same significance and that indeed

all of the professional tasks are perceived by the group as a whole to be of importance to the vocational educator serving special needs students. Based on this survey of student needs, it was decided to discuss each of the topics in the text as completely as possible in order to best meet their needs. A copy of the "self-directed needs assessment" is included as Appendix A. The results of student ratings on the "self-directed needs assessment" instrument is included in Appendix B.

Winter, 1978 Course

The winter course had an enrollment of 17 individuals, primarily from the Twin Cities area. The self-directed needs assessment was utilized; however, this time the assessment was used only by the students in selecting those learning activities which would best meet their individual needs. Several students opted to complete all of the learning activities in the text which exceeded course requirements. The reason given for completing all of the learning activities in the text was that these individuals felt a need for improved skills in all of the areas covered by the text. When the summer course was offered, the instructor obtained feedback from students on a daily basis concerning the relevance of the topic covered for that day and suggestions for improving the manner in which it was presented. Although no formal record was made of the daily feedback, all recommendations and suggestions were carefully considered in the development of the instructor's guide and later offerings of the course.

A formal evaluation was conducted for both the Summer 1977 and Winter 1978 courses. The course evaluations consisted of two different assessment techniques. The first consisted of the "Student Opinion Survey" which is used by the Department of Vocational and Technical Education for all courses offered by the Department. The survey is computer scored and returned to the Department in the form of a computer print-out. The evaluation form consists of several sections including: the instructor, the reading material (including the textbook), the tests, and 14 general questions relating to the course as a whole. A copy of the "Student Opinion Survey" is included in Appendix C.

The opinion survey helped to point out problem areas and strengths for both offerings of the course. An analysis of the responses for the Summer offering (Appendix D) and Winter 1978 offering (Appendix E) points out the following problem areas and strengths.

Summer, 1977 Course

Problem Area Identified

Instructor: none

Reading material: 5% found difficulty with the text (Note: 5% constitutes one response).

Tests: No response rate resulted from the fact that the course was graded on a basis of participation in class, and completion of six inservice experiences, and two short papers. No tests were administered.

General: Some confusion seemed to exist concerning the course assignments (5%) and concerning how well participants were doing in the course (30%).

Strengths Identified

Instructor: All of the students rated the instructor very favorably in all five areas.

Reading material: Most of the students rated the reading material above the acceptable level on all three items.

Tests: Not applicable. (See "Tests" above)

General: Most comments were very favorable to the course as presented.

Winter, 1978 Course

Problem Areas Identified

Instructor: One respondent (5.9%) felt that the subject matter could have been presented more clearly. Four (23.5%) indicated that when appropriate, the instructor did not relate "course material to other areas of knowledge." This may be the result of the narrow focus of the course on serving special needs students in vocational education.

Reading materials: Six respondents indicated that the reading materials (text) did not hold their attention easily. This may stem from the organization of the text into modules designed to assist the student in acquiring specific skills and competencies. Three respondents indicated that the text was not clearly written and two indicated that the text did not serve well the purpose for which it was intended.

Tests: The ratings for this category are not meaningful due to the fact that no tests were administered. The students were evaluated based on the completion of nine inservice experiences and a plan for improving teaching/services for special needs students within their schools.

General: Two students indicated that they were not provided adequate information about how they were doing. One indicated uncertainty with regards to what are the student's responsibilities in the course. In addition, one respondent indicated a dislike for the subject matter of the course.

Strengths Identified

Instructor: The respondents rated the instructor favorably. The most significant ratings were in the areas of (2) "the instructor was approachable", and (3) "the instructor got me interested in the subject."

Reading material: The reading material (text) was rated favorably with 58.9% of the respondents indicating that they "strongly agreed" that the text served well the purpose for which it was intended.

Tests: Not applicable. (See "Tests" under "Problem Areas Identified.")

General: The ratings in this section were very favorable. All respondents "agreed" to "most strongly agreed" in the following areas:

(14) Procedures for determining grades were appropriate.

(15) Amount of work required was appropriate.

(17) Adequate help was available when I needed it.

In addition, all respondents indicated that:

(20) They liked the instructor as a person.

(21) The instructor's overall teaching ability was fair to exceptionally good.

(22) They learned at least "a fair amount".

(23) And they put "a fair amount" to "very much" effort into this course.

A second approach to course evaluation was also implemented in order to obtain a more complete and accurate evaluation of the inservice course. The second approach consisted of ten items for which the students were requested to respond in short comment form. The Student Evaluation Form is included in Appendix F. Responses were grouped by item and a complete list of questions and comments from course students is included in Appendix G for the Summer 1977 course and Appendix H for the Winter 1978 course.

It is obvious that the overall evaluation of the inservice course was very positive as evidenced by both course evaluation techniques which were implemented. All criticisms were of a constructive nature and were considered in planning and conducting subsequent offerings of the inservice course. Based on the course evaluations, it was possible to make the inservice course "Working with Special Needs Students" even more meaningful and effective for the vocational teacher serving students with special needs.

D. An Impact Report Of Course Offering

Purpose of the Impact Study

In order to determine the impact of this project, a follow-up study was conducted for students who attended the Summer, 1977 offering of the inservice course. The overall objective of the follow-up study was to determine the effect of the inservice course on special needs students served by those teachers who had enrolled in the course.

In addition, the impact study was designed to determine the most efficient and effective manner in which to conduct studies of this nature. Additional information concerning the types of follow-ups used in the study and a comparison of the various methods is contained in a separate report entitled "Inservice for Vocational Instructors In Serving Special Needs Students: A Course Follow-Up Study." The project report is available through the E.R.I.C. Document Reproduction Service.

Procedures for the Impact Study

The follow-up study was conducted during the month of April, 1978 and three approaches were used to obtain the information desired. The three methods of data collection included mail-out questionnaires, telephone interviews, and personal interviews. In all three cases, the same instrument was utilized to record the responses. See Appendix I for the Questionnaire Form which was developed for this follow-up study.

Three areas of information were considered of importance for the follow-up study. The first part dealt with the current title of the teacher and number of special needs students the teacher has had contact with in the eight months since the course was offered. The second part

was concerned with whether or not each of the eight areas covered in the course had been implemented by the teacher and reasons for why or why not the concepts had been implemented. The final section deals with general feelings toward the course and consisted primarily of open-ended questions to be completed by former students.

Results of the Study

The following is a summary of the responses obtained from those students who enrolled in the Summer, 1977 offering of the inservice course. A copy of the information collection form is included as Appendix I of this project report. The results of Parts A and C are reported by first listing the question, followed by the various responses. The number in "italicized type" indicate the number of responses for the question or category. Results for Part B of the impact study are reported on the information collection form using "italicized numerals." For example; in Part B, question number 1a, nine (9) respondents report having implemented the concept of "learner identification and development of a learner profile and prescription", and eight (8) reported not having implemented these concepts.

Part A.

1. What is your current position? (Job Titles) Secondary Business Teacher, 3rd Grade Teacher, AVTI Auto/Light Mechanic Instructor, University Student Teacher Supervisor, University Administrative Fellow for Vocational Education, Wiring Houses, Registered Nurse, Trades and Industry Coordination, Industrial Arts Teacher, Industrial Arts Teacher Special Needs Teacher, Secondary Educable Mentally Handicapped.

Instruction, Instructor, Project Direction-Vocational Special Needs, Preschool Coordinator, School Home/Health Occupation Instructor, Chef Instructor.

2. In this position, how many special needs students have you had contact with this school year? *203*

3. Who identified these special needs students? Check all that apply.

8	a. Myself	*2*	e. Parents
5	b. Counselor	*2*	f. Student
4	c. Other Teacher	*1*	g. Administrator
3	d. Coordinator	*7*	h. Other*

*Employment Agency-*1*, Vocational Rehabilitation-*1*, School Committee-*1*, Team Teacher-*1*, Medical or Psychological Testing-*1*, Child Special Education Case Manager-*1*.

Name_____ Date_____

Part A.

1. What is your current position?_____
(Job Title)

2. In this position, how many special needs students have you had contact with this school year?

_____
(Number)

3. Who identified these special needs students? (Check all that apply.)

___ a. Myself
___ b. Counselor
___ c. Other Teacher
___ d. Coordinator
___ e. Parents
___ f. Student
___ g. Administrator
___ h. Other_____
(Specify)

Part B. The following series of questions relate to selected topics of the course content.

1. Learner Identification and Development of a Learner Profile and Prescription.

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 9

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 9

Who did it help?

1 Parents
7 Student
7 Myself
2 Other School Personnel

No ___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support
_____
(Specify)

No 8

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

3 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
3 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
3 7. Other_____
(Specify)
- *Not Teaching*
- *No Special Needs Students*
- *Does not apply*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

3 Too Little | 16 Appropriate | Too Much

2. Developing Cooperative Instructional Arrangements

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 9 | No 9

Do You feel this helped your program?

Yes 9

Who did it help?

- 3 Parents
- 8 Student
- 7 Myself
- 3 Other School Personnel

No ___

Why not?

- ___ Insufficient Time
- ___ Insufficient Funds
- ___ Insufficient Student Response
- ___ Insufficient Support
- ___ (Specify)

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

- 4 1. No Need
- ___ 2. Lack of Information
- 3 3. Already Implemented
- ___ 4. School Personnel
- ___ 5. Money
- ___ 6. Time
- 2 7. Other ___ (Specify)
  - *Not Teaching*
  - *Not in that area*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

1 Too Little | 18 Appropriate | Too Much

3. Developing a Special Needs Resource Inventory

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 9 | No 9

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 9

Who did it help?

- 2 Parents
- 5 Student
- 6 Myself
- 2 Other School Personnel

No ___

Why not?

- ___ Insufficient Time
- ___ Insufficient Funds
- ___ Insufficient Student Response
- ___ Insufficient Support
- ___ (Specify)

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

- 5 1. No Need
- ___ 2. Lack of Information
- 1 3. Already Implemented
- ___ 4. School Personnel
- ___ 5. Money
- 1 6. Time
- 2 7. Other ___ (Specify)
  - *Not Teaching*
  - *Not in that area*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

3 Too Little | 16 Appropriate | Too

4. Development of a Special Needs Advisory Committee

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 5

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 5

Who did it help?

3 Parents
3 Student
4 Myself
2 Other School Personnel

No ___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No 13

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

7 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
2 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
1 6. Time
3 7. Other _____ (Specify)

- *Not Teaching*
- *Not sure how it would fit in at Jr. High level*
- *Not in that area*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

5. Identifying and Analyzing Career Clusters

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 7

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 6

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No 1

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No 11

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

4 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
2 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
5 7. Other _____ (Specify)

- *Feel inappropriate to talk with students*
- *Not teaching*
- *Some work already done*
- *Not in that area*
- *Not teaching any vocational cluster*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

2 Too Little 14 Appropriate 3 Too Much

6. Developing and Sequencing Instructional Modules

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 10

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 7

Who did it help?

___ Parents
7 Students
6 Myself
2 Other School Personnel

No 1

Why not?

1 Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
1 Insufficient Support
___ (Specify)

- *Divirsification of Programs*

No 8

Why not? (What were the barriers

3 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
2 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
1 6. Time
2 7. Other ___ (Specify)

- *Not Teaching*
- *Tutors not available*
- *Not in that area*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

5 Too Little 12 Appropriate Too Much

7. Analyzing Instructional Materials

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 13

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 11

Who did it help?

___ Parents
8 Student
9 Myself
4 Other School Personnel

No ___

Why not?

1 Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support
___ (Specify)

No 5

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

2 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
1 5. Money
___ 6. Time
3 7. Other ___ (Specify)

- *Not Teaching*
- *Tutors not available*
- *Not in that area*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

5 Too Little 14 Appropriate Too Much

8. Providing Reinforcement and Feedback

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 12

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 11

Who did it help?

- 2 Parents
- 10 Student
- 10 Myself
- 2 Other School Personnel

No 1

Why not?

- 1 Insufficient Time
- ___ Insufficient Funds
- ___ Insufficient Student Response
- ___ Insufficient Support
- ___ _____ (Specify)

No 6

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

- 2 1. No Need
- ___ 2. Lack of Information
- 2 3. Already Implemented
- ___ 4. School Personnel
- ___ 5. Money
- ___ 6. Time
- 2 7. Other _____ (Specify)
  - *Not Teaching*
  - *Not in that area*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

4 Too Little — 15 Appropriate — Too Much

9. Modifying the Learning Enviornment

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 11

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 11

Who did it help?

- 1 Parents
- 11 Student
- 8 Myself
- 3 Other School Personnel

No ___

Why not?

- ___ Insufficient Time
- ___ Insufficient Funds
- ___ Insufficient Student Response
- ___ Insufficient Support
- ___ _____ (Specify)

No 7

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

- 4 1. No Need
- ___ 2. Lack of Information
- ___ 3. Already Implemented
- ___ 4. School Personnel
- ___ 5. Money
- 1 6. Time
- 1 7. Other _____ (Specify)
  - *Not Teaching*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

2 Too Little — 16 Appropriate — Too Much

10. Monitoring and Evaluating Student Progress

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 11

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 10

Who did it help?

- 2 Parents
- 8 Student
- 7 Myself
- 3 Other School Personnel

No 1

Why not?

- 1 Insufficient Time
- ___ Insufficient Funds
- ___ Insufficient Student Response
- ___ Insufficient Support
- ___ (Specify)

No 8

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

- 2 1. No Need
- ___ 2. Lack of Information
- 4 3. Already Implemented
- ___ 4. School Personnel
- ___ 5. Money
- ___ 6. Time
- 1 7. Other ___ (Specify)

- *Not Teaching*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

4 Too Little — 15 Appropriate — Too Much

11. Conducting a Learner Follow-Up Survey

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes 4

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes 4

Who did it help?

- ___ Parents
- 3 Student
- 3 Myself
- 1 Other School Personnel

No ___

Why not?

- ___ Insufficient Time
- ___ Insufficient Funds
- ___ Insufficient Student Response
- ___ Insufficient Support
- ___ (Specify)

No 14

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

- 7 1. No Need
- 1 2. Lack of Information
- 3 3. Already Implemented
- ___ 4. School Personnel
- ___ 5. Money
- 1 6. Time
- 3 7. Other ___ (Specify)

- *In Process*
- *Not Teaching*
- *Planned for next year*

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

2 Too Little — 17 Appropriate — Too Much

Part C

1. Indicate how this course helped you in working with the following groups: (circle one)

	Helped a Great Deal	Helped Some	Did Not Help
Special Needs Student	6	10	-
Other Students	3	10	-
Parents	2	9	4
Administrators	2	9	5
Counselors	4	6	3
Special Needs Staff	9	4	2
Remedial Staff	7	3	3
Other Teachers	3	9	3
Other _____ (Specify)	1	-	-

2. What do you feel were voids in this course?

3 - No contact with special needs students.

- More on legislation and political moves regarding: cutting teachers, cutting programs and then implementations on special needs programs.
- Having actual program visits (e.g. Focus, W.E.D., Special Education).
- Need to better define CRA - very happy with course.
- Talk more of special services out of the mainstream. Don't know if Vocational Educators are aware of all the problems special needs students will bring with them. Hope they will be made aware of it before they are certified. Evaluation more goal oriented.

- I deal with all special education students. Felt the course was designed for vocational education teachers.
- Could use more time. Perhaps more time given to a fundamental introduction to special needs for those who are new to the area.
- In the area of learning styles. A bit more on interpersonal skills.
- More practical teaching techniques rather than just talking about them.

3. What suggestions do you have to help us improve this course?

2 - Visit class with special needs students.
- More concrete examples.
- Follow-up workshop (to the course).
- Emphasize disability groups and determination.
- Emphasize support services (i.e. CETA, DVR).
- How to help other staff work with special needs students.
- Observation of handicapped students and evaluation tools which are easily used by Vocational Education and Special Education people.
- What you have already done on work evaluation - strengthen it.
- Maybe a simulation from CEC on reading disabilities. What is it like to have a handicap.
- Not enough time.
- Need hands-on experience.
- Bring some special needs learners in the classroom and let the professor demonstrate how he would handle the daily teaching.

4. Rate your change in attitude toward working with special needs students as a result of this course.

- More sympathetic to what special needs staff is trying to do. More aware of what curriculum materials are available. More aware of teaching techniques to be used with special needs students.
- Helped to realize some of the problems that were occurring. Helped open my eyes. Realized that special needs involves more than just low interest/ability. Helped attitude a lot. More interested in special needs students.
- Worked with special needs people for 8-10 years previous to taking course. (No change)
- More aware of special needs students in general. Less prone to ignore special needs students. Aware that there are things that can be done to help special needs students.
- More aware of the needs of special needs students which are different from the average student. More positive attitude in working with special needs students than before the course.
- More aware of the special needs of these students. Need to help is much more obvious. Can better meet and better qualified to meet their special needs. Acquired knowledge concerning parents, teachers, so I can now give advice and assist.
- No formal training in Severe Learning and Behavior Problems with special needs personnel.
- Feel that working with these students is not for me.

- Feel less frustration in working with special needs students, less fear in approaching special needs students - a lot of reference and resources in working with special needs students.
- Employer orientation to special needs students, more cooperation with coordinator.
- Prior view of special needs services was that they needed to be handled differently.
- Able to communicate knowledgeably with counselors and special needs staff.
- I had a highly positive attitude entering the course.
- I feel their needs are just as important as all other students.

5. What further training do you feel you need in the area of Vocational Special Needs?
   - Job placement of special needs students.
   - Basic methods with special needs students.
   - Special needs coordinator training.
   - Learner packets for different areas of interest.
   - Internship and feedback session.
   - Course in counseling or psychology taught by special needs personnel with focus on personalities and make-up of special needs students.
   - Individual counseling of special needs students.
   - Stronger background and practice in vocational skills. Finding out what community resources are available to them - awareness of resources and machine adaptations for special needs students -

awareness of programs presently operating with special needs students in the mainstream and all phases of handicappness

- Work with some handicapped or more severely handicapped.
- Courses that would cover topics in greater detail.
- Identification, diagnosis, and appropriate placement techniques.
- Vocational evaluation.
- Internship or similar placement for limited amount of time.
- Actual teaching techniques.

E. Description of Teacher Educator Workshop

The project had originally hoped to prepare two or three teacher educators, but due to the great interest expressed by teacher educators in Minnesota, the project goal was far exceeded. The workshop was led off by an introduction of the staff, consultant, and teacher educators. An overview of past and current efforts of the Department of Vocational and Technical Education at the University of Minnesota to assist vocational teachers to improve educational programs and services for special needs students was given. This was followed by a presentation dealing with problems encountered by special needs students in vocational education, current legislation, and problems confronting the vocational teacher serving students with special needs.

The text for the course was then disseminated and reviewed by its author L. Allen Phelps. Next the Instructor's Guide which was developed as a part of this project was distributed and discussed. An explanation of how the guide might be used was given and each of the eight units were discussed briefly. Fifteen copies of the Instructor's Guide were provided to participating teacher educators. The Instructor's Guides were received positively by the teacher educators and questions and comments concerning vocational education teachers working effectively with special needs students were entertained for the remainder of the workshop. The following page outlines the agenda of the teacher educator workshop.

AGENDA

ORIENTATION TO VoEd 5100 - SPECIAL NEEDS

I. INTRODUCTIONS - OVERVIEW OF SESSION

II. INTRO TO SPECIAL NEEDS EFFORT OR THRUST OF DEPARTMENT

III. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE COURSE

IV. THE TEXT AND ITS RATIONALE

V. OVERVIEW OF INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

VI. OVERVIEW OF EACH UNIT

During the month of December, 1977 a list of key teacher educators in Minnesota was developed and these individuals were invited by personal letter to attend the teacher educator workshop. The workshop was designed to prepare them to assist vocational teachers to work more effectively with special needs students. The workshop was held on Friday, January 13, 1978, and generated even more interest than had been anticipated. A total of 13 teacher educators attended the workshop. The teacher educators who attended this workshop were:

Jerome Moss, Jr.
Professor & Chairman
Vocational & Technical Education
University of Minnesota

David C. Bjorkquist
Professor & Head
Industrial Education
University of Minnesota

George H. Copa
Professor
Agricultural Education
Minnesota Research & Development Center
University of Minnesota

Gary W. Leske
Associate Professor
Agricultural Education
University of Minnesota

Gary McLean
Associate Professor
Business Education
University of Minnesota

David Kingsbury
Vocational Special Needs
Project Director
Bemidji State University

Cheryl Fedje
Assistant Professor
Home Economics Education
University of Minnesota
Duluth

Ron Dryer
Research Fellow
Minnesota Research & Development Center
University of Minnesota

Deena Allen
Research Associate
Minnesota Research & Development Center
University of Minnesota

Terry Kayser
Research Assistant
Special Education
University of Minnesota

Emma Whiteford
Professor
Home Economics Education
University of Minnesota

William Kavanaugh
Professor
Industrial Education
University of Minnesota

Eileen Ostergaard
Curriculum Adviser
Minnesota Instructional Materials Center
University of Minnesota

IV. References

References

Bobbitt, Frank. Project REMEDY: Rural education in Michigan especially disadvantaged youth. East Lansing: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1971.

Contemporary Research Incorporated. Assessment of ethnic minority student needs in vocational education: Volume I: Executive summary. Sacramento: Vocational Education Unit, California State Department of Education, 1974.

Evans, Rupert N., Clark, Gary M., and Phelps, Allen. Vocational education for the special needs student: Competencies and models for the preparation of personnel. Unpublished grant proposal to U.S. Office of Education. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1975.

Clark, Kenneth B. Education stimulation of racially disadvantaged children. In Passow, A. Harry (Ed.). Education in depressed areas. New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University, 1963.

General Accounting Office. What is the role of federal assistance for vocational education? Washington, D.C.: Comptroller General of the United States, December, 1974, 1976.

Gold, Marc W. Research on the vocational habilitation of the retarded: The present, the future. In N.R. Ellis (Ed.). International review of research in mental retardation. Volume 6. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Groves, Ramsey M. A national survey of vocational education programs for students with special needs. Columbus: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, 1966. ED 011 041.

Meyerson, Lee. Somatopsychology of physical disability. In Cruickshank, William M. (Ed.) Psychology of exceptional children and youth. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Olympus Research Corporation. An Assessment of vocational education programs for the handicapped under Part B of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act: Executive summary. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Research Corporation, 1975.

Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Public Law 95-76. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Young, Earl B. and others. Vocational education for handicapped persons: Handbook for program implementation. Washington, D..: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

V. Appendices

Appendix A

Self-Directed Needs Assessment Instrument

SELF-DIRECTED NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Self-Directed Needs Assessment is designed to assist you in selecting modules and inservice experiences which are appropriate for meeting the inservice education needs of teachers and other professionals working with special needs learners. It can be used by individuals or teams to assess: (1) the importance of a series of professional tasks in their local program situation, and (2) to what extent they feel they need to know more about the tasks.

A series of 24 professional tasks are listed on the assessment checklist to be reviewed. For each task the reader is asked to consider two questions. Based on the response to these questions, suggestions are made which direct the reader to specific modules and inservice experiences which pertain to the task.

Once the inservice experiences have been completed, the Self Needs Assessment can be used again to determine the amount of information gained.

SELF - DIRECTED NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Directions: This checklist is designed to help you (or you and your colleagues) select modules and inservice experiences which are pertinent to your needs and interests. For each of the tasks listed in the left hand column, you (or the team) should answer questions 1 and 2. If you do not perform the task leave it blank. After completing the checklist, add your cumulative score for each task as shown in the example. You may want to discuss the results with your inservice director.

Name: _____

Position: _____

School: _____

Date: _____

Professional Tasks	Question 1: How critical is successful performance of this task of the overall effectiveness of your program?					Question 2: I feel a need to know more about this task?					Cumulative Score	Suggested Modules: If the cumulative score for a task is 7 or greater, you should consider reviewing the following modules and inservice experiences.
	Unimportant		Important		Extremely Critical	No		Yes, a bit more		Yes, much more		
1 Collect and use available assessment information	1	2	(3)	4	5	1	2	3	(4)	5	7	Module 1; I.E. I.1, I.2
1 Collect and use available assessment information	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 1; I.E. I.1, I.2
2 Collaborate with other educators, specialists and parents in evaluating the learner's educational needs	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 1; I.E. I.2
3 Develop an individual learning prescription describing optimum conditions and media for instruction	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 1; I.E. I.3
4 Design and implement a system for monitoring and feeding back learner progress and achievement on a regular basis	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 1; I.E. I.2 Module 5; I.E. V.2 Module 7; I.E. VII.1
5 Identify resource personnel (e.g. reading specialists or bilinguists) capable of providing supportive help	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 2; I.E. II.1 Module 3; I.E. III.1
6 Formalize a cooperative, team teaching plan for serving special needs learners	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 2; I.E. II.1
7 Identify a variety of community and governmental agency resources in planning instructional programs and services	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 3; I.E. III.1
8 Establish and/or use program advisory committees	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 3; I.E. III.2
9 Identify occupations and clusters of occupations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 4; I.E. IV.1
10 Analyze occupational/career clusters to determine competencies needed in the world of work	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	_____	Module 4; I.E. IV.2

Professional Tasks	Question 1: How critical is successful performance of this task of the overall effectiveness of your program?					Question 2: I feel a need to know more about this task?					Cumulative Score	Suggested Modules If the cumulative score for a task is 7 or greater, you should consiuer reviewing the following modules and inservice experiences.
	Unimportant		Important		Extremely Critical	No		Yes, a bit more		Yes, much more		
11 Identify the basic aptitudes and competencies (e.g. finger dexterity or sequencing skills) required for employment in a given career.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 4; I.E. IV.2
12 Plan a sequence of modules or units of instruction according to the learner's needs	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 5; I.E. V.2
13 Identify modules or units of instruction appropriate for special needs learners	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 5; I.E. V.1
14 Coordinate occupational and academic instruction	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 5; I.E. V.1
15 Develop performance objectives and goals	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 5; I.E. V.1
16 Identify instructional activities appropriate for special needs learners	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 5; I.E. V.1
17 Employ techniques or principles of special instruction (e.g. discrimination learning or cue redundancy)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 5; I.E. V.1 Module 6; I.E. VI.2
18 Evaluate and select instructional materials appropriate for special needs learners	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 6; I.E. VI.1
19 Provide reinforcement for learning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 6; I.E. VI.2
20 Manage and modify when necessary the tools, equipment, facilities, materials, and conditions in the learning environment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 6; I.E. VI.3
21 Plan and coordinate off-campus work (on-the-job) instruction	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 6; I.E. VI.4
22 Plan and coordinate on-campus work (on-the-job) instruction	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 6; I.E. VI.4
23 Use a variety of performance measures to assess a learner's progress	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 7; I.E. VII.1
24 Obtain follow-up information on special needs students leaving or graduating from school programs	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	____	Module 7; I.E. VII. 2

Appendix B

Results From Participant s Ratings On The Self-Directed Needs Assessment

SELF-DIRECTED NEEDS ASSESSMENT

** Results from Course Participant Needs Assessment **

Professional Tasks	Mean	Total Respondants
1. Collect and use available assessment information.	7	19
2. Collaborate with other educators, specialists and parents in evaluating the learner's educational needs.	7	19
3. Develop an individual learning prescription describing optimum conditions and media for instruction.	7	19
4. Design and implement a system for monitoring and feeding back learner progress and achievement on a regular basis.	7	19
5. Identify resource personnel (3.g., reading specialists or bilinguists) capable of providing supportive help.	6	19
6. Formalize a cooperative, team teaching plan for serving special needs learners.	6	19
7. Identify a variety of community and governmental agency resources in planning instructional programs and services.	6	19
8. Establish and/or use program advisory committees.	6	19
9. Identify occupations and clusters of occupations.	6	19
10. Analyze occupational/career clusters to determine competencies needed in the world of work.	7	18
11. Identify the basic apritude and competencies (e.g., finger dexterity or sequencing skills) required for employment in a given career.	7	19
12. Plan a sequence of modules or units of instruction according to the learner's needs.	7	19

Professional Tasks	Mean	Total Respondants
13. Identify modules or units of instruction appropriate for special needs learners.	7	19
14. Coordinate occupation and academic instruction.	6	19
15. Develop performance objectives and goals.	7	18
16. Identify instructional activities appropriate for special needs learners.	7	19
17. Employ techniques or principles of special instruction (e.g. discrimination learning or cue redundancy).	7	18
18. Evaluate and select instructional materials appropriate for special needs learners.	7	19
19. Provide reinforcement for learning.	7	19
20. Manage and modify when necessary the tools, equipment, facilities, materials, and conditions in the learning enviornment.	7	19
21. Plan and coordinate off-campus work (on-the-job) instruction.	7	19
22. Plan and coordinate on-campus work (on-the-job) instruction.	6	19
23. Use a variety of performance measures to assess a learner's progress.	7	19
24. Obtain follow-up information on special needs students leaving or graduating from school programs.	7	19

Appendix C
Student Opinion Survey Form

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

GENERAL

This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to share your views about certain aspects of this course with your instructor. For each item below, please indicate the response closest to your opinion by circling the appropriate number. Please circle only one number for each item.

Thank you for your help.

measurement services center
9 clarence avenue s.e. minneapolis, minnesota 55414

Course _____

Instructor _____

Quarter & Year _____

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Most Strongly Agree
The INSTRUCTOR:							
1. clearly presented the subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. was approachable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. got me interested in her/his subject.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. raised challenging questions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. when appropriate, related course material to other areas of knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The READING MATERIAL--including the textbook:							
6. held my attention easily.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. was clearly written.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. served well the purpose for which it was intended.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The TESTS:							
9. concentrated on the important points and topics in the subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. seemed to have been carefully and conscientiously prepared.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. were about the right length.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. were clearly worded.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. seemed to be good measures of my knowledge and understanding.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
In GENERAL:							
14. procedures for determining grades were appropriate for this course.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. the amount of work required was appropriate for the number of credits offered.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. adequate information about how well I was doing was readily available.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. adequate help was available when I needed it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. my responsibilities in the course were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please continue on the other side. →

19. How much did you like the SUBJECT MATTER of the course, forgetting about the instructor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disliked Intensely	Disliked Greatly	Disliked Somewhat	Liked Somewhat	Liked A Lot	Liked Very Much	Liked Exceptionally Well

20. How much did you like this instructor AS A PERSON?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disliked Intensely	Disliked Considerably	Disliked Somewhat	Liked Somewhat	Liked A Lot	Liked Very Much	Liked Exceptionally Well

21. How would you rate this instructor's OVERALL TEACHING ABILITY?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Exceptionally Good

22. How much would you say you LEARNED from this instructor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

23. How much EFFORT did you put into this course?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

24. In which YEAR in school are you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Adult Special

25. Was this specific course REQUIRED of you?

1	2
Yes	No

26. What is your overall cumulative GRADE-POINT AVERAGE at the University of Minnesota?

1	2	3	4	5
2.0 or Below	2.1-2.5	2.6-3.0	3.1-3.5	3.6-4.0

27. Which SEX are you?

1	2
Female	Male

Your instructor may provide some additional questions. If so, please use this section to answer them. If not, please leave this section blank.

28.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	32.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	33.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	34.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	35.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

© Copyright 1973 Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota

Appendix D

Student Opinion Survey Results

Summer, 1977 Results

			FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PERCENTS)							
THE INSTRUCTOR:	MEAN	SD	VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VERY STRONGLY AGREE	MOST STRONGLY AGREE	NO RESPONSE
1. CLEARLY PRESENTED THE SUBJECT MATTER.	5.0	1.1	0	0	0	40.0	25.0	25.0	10.0	0
2. WAS APPROACHABLE.	6.0	.9	0	0	0	10.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	0
3. GOT ME INTERESTED IN HIS/HER SUBJECT.	5.7	1.0	0	0	0	20.0	10.0	55.0	15.0	0
4. RAISED CHALLENGING QUESTIONS.	5.3	1.1	0	0	0	30.0	20.0	35.0	15.0	0
5. WHEN APPROPRIATE, RELATED COURSE MATERIAL TO OTHER AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE.	5.5	.9	0	0	0	15.0	30.0	40.0	15.0	0
THE READING MATERIAL--INCLUDING THE TEXTBOOK:										
6. HELD MY ATTENTION EASILY.	4.9	1.3	0	5.0	0	45.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	0
7. WAS CLEARLY WRITTEN.	5.0	1.4	0	5.0	0	40.0	10.0	30.0	15.0	0
8. SERVED WELL THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH IT WAS INTENDED.	5.3	1.2	0	0	5.0	30.0	15.0	35.0	15.0	0
THE TESTS:										
9. CONCENTRATED ON THE IMPORTANT POINTS AND TOPICS IN THE SUBJECT MATTER.	6.2	.4	0	0	0	0	0	25.0	5.0	70.0
10. SEEMED TO HAVE BEEN CAREFULLY AND CONSCIENTIOUSLY PREPARED.	6.2	.4	0	0	0	0	0	20.0	5.0	75.0
11. WERE ABOUT THE RIGHT LENGTH.	5.8	1.1	0	0	0	5.0	0	15.0	5.0	75.0
12. WERE CLEARLY WORDED.	6.0	.6	0	0	0	0	5.0	20.0	5.0	70.0
13. SEEMED TO BE GOOD MEASURES OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING.	5.8	1.1	0	0	0	5.0	0	15.0	5.0	75.0

IN GENERAL:	MEAN	SD	VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VERY STRONGLY AGREE	MOST STRONGLY AGREE	NO RESPONSE
14. PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING GRADES WERE APPROPRIATE FOR THIS COURSE.	5.4	1.1	0	0	0	30.0	10.0	35.0	15.0	10.0
15. THE AMOUNT OF WORK REQUIRED WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE NUMBER OF CREDITS OFFERED.	5.0	1.2	0	0	5.0	35.0	25.0	20.0	15.0	0
16. ADEQUATE INFORMATION ABOUT HOW WELL I WAS DOING WAS READILY AVAILABLE.	4.4	1.3	0	0	30.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	5.0	5.0
17. ADEQUATE HELP WAS AVAILABLE WHEN I NEEDED IT.	5.4	1.1	0	0	0	30.0	20.0	30.0	20.0	0
18. MY RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE COURSE WERE CLEARLY DEFINED.	5.6	1.2	0	0	5.0	15.0	20.0	35.0	25.0	0

19. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE COURSE, FORGETTING ABOUT THE INSTRUCTOR.

DISLIKED INTENSELY	DISLIKED GREATLY	DISLIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED A LOT	LIKED VERY MUCH	LIKED EXCEPTIONALLY WELL	NO RESPONSE	MEAN	SD
0	0	5.0	5.0	30.0	35.0	25.0	0	5.7	1.1

20. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE THIS INSTRUCTOR AS A PERSON.

DISLIKED INTENSELY	DISLIKED CONSIDERABLY	DISLIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED A LOT	LIKED VERY MUCH	LIKED EXCEPTIONALLY WELL	NO RESPONSE		
0	0	0	10.0	25.0	30.0	35.0	0	5.9	1.1

22. HOW MUCH WOULD YOU SAY YOU LEARNED FROM THIS INSTRUCTOR.

ALMOST NOTHING	VERY LITTLE	LITTLE	A FAIR AMOUNT	MUCH	VERY MUCH	AN EXCEPTIONAL AMOUNT	NO RESPONSE		
0	0	0	20.0	25.0	45.0	10.0	0	5.4	.9

23. HOW MUCH EFFORT DID YOU PUT INTO THIS COURSE.

ALMOST NONE	VERY LITTLE	LITTLE	A FAIR AMOUNT	MUCH	VERY MUCH	AN EXCEPTIONAL AMOUNT	NO RESPONSE	MEAN	SD
0	0	0	15.0	25.0	60.0	0	0	5.4	.8

24. IN WHICH YEAR IN SCHOOL ARE YOU.

FRESHMAN	SOPHOMORE	JUNIOR	SENIOR	GRADUATE	ADULT SPECIAL	NO RESPONSE
0	0	5.0	0	80.0	15.0	0

25. WAS THIS SPECIFIC COURSE REQUIRED OF YOU.

YES	NO	NO RESPONSE
20.0	75.0	5.0

26. WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL CUMULATIVE GRADE-POINT AVERAGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

2.0 OR BELOW	2.1-2.5	2.6-3.0	3.1-3.5	3.6-4.0	NO RESPONSE
0	0	15.0	40.0	40.0	5.0

27. WHICH SEX ARE YOU.

FEMALE	MALE	NO RESPONSE
20.0	75.0	5.0

Appendix E
Student Opinion Survey Results
Winter, 1978 Course

			FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PERCENTS)							
THE INSTRUCTOR:	MEAN	SD	VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VERY STRONGLY AGREE	MOST STRONGLY AGREE	NO RESPONSE
1. CLEARLY PRESENTED THE SUBJECT MATTER	4.6	1.1	0	0	5.9	58.8	17.6	5.9	11.8	0
2. WAS APPROACHABLE.	5.5	1.0	0	0	0	17.6	35.3	29.4	17.6	0
3. GOT ME INTERESTED IN HIS/HER SUBJECT.	5.1	.8	0	0	0	23.5	52.9	17.6	5.9	0
4. RAISED CHALLENGING QUESTIONS.	4.9	1.0	0	0	0	41.2	23.5	17.6	5.9	11.8
5. WHEN APPROPRIATE, RELATED COURSE MATERIAL TO OTHER AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE.	5.0	1.5	0	0	23.5	11.8	29.4	11.8	23.5	0
THE READING MATERIAL--INCLUDING THE TEXTBOOK:										
6. HELD MY ATTENTION EASILY.	3.9	1.3	5.9	0	29.4	47.1	5.9	5.9	5.9	0
7. WAS CLEARLY WRITTEN.	4.5	1.1	0	0	17.6	41.2	23.5	11.8	5.9	0
8. SERVED WELL THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH IT WAS INTENDED.	5.0	1.7	5.9	0	5.9	29.4	17.6	17.6	23.5	0
THE TESTS:										
9. CONCENTRATED ON THE IMPORTANT POINTS AND TOPICS IN THE SUBJECT MATTER.	4.9	.8	0	0	0	23.5	23.5	17.6	0	35.3
10. SEEMED TO HAVE BEEN CAREFULLY AND CONSCIENTIOUSLY PREPARED.	5.0	1.1	0	0	5.9	17.6	11.8	29.4	0	35.3
11. WERE ABOUT THE RIGHT LENGTH.	5.3	.9	0	0	0	17.6	11.8	35.3	0	35.3
12. WERE CLEARLY WORDED.	5.1	1.1	0	0	5.9	11.8	11.8	29.4	0	41.2
13. SEEMED TO BE GOOD MEASURES OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING.	4.7	.9	0	0	5.9	17.6	29.4	11.8	0	35.3

IN GENERAL:	MEAN	SD	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (PERCENTS) VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	VERY STRONGLY AGREE	MOST STRONGLY AGREE	NO RESPONSE
14. PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING GRADES WERE APPROPRIATE FOR THIS COURSE.	5.3	1.2	0	0	0	35.3	17.6	23.5	17.6	5.9
15. THE AMOUNT OF WORK REQUIRED WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE NUMBER OF CREDITS OFFERED.	5.2	1.1	0	0	0	29.4	35.3	17.6	17.6	0
16. ADEQUATE INFORMATION ABOUT HOW WELL I WAS DOING WAS READILY AVAILABLE.	5.3	1.4	0	0	11.8	11.8	23.5	17.6	23.5	11.8
17. ADEQUATE HELP WAS AVAILABLE WHEN I NEEDED IT.	5.2	1.1	0	0	0	29.4	41.2	11.8	17.6	0
18. MY RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE COURSE WERE CLEARLY DEFINED.	5.5	1.2	0	0	5.9	11.8	35.3	23.5	23.5	0

19. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE COURSE, FORGETTING ABOUT THE INSTRUCTOR.

DISLIKED INTENSELY	DISLIKED GREATLY	DISLIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED A LOT	LIKED VERY MUCH	LIKED EXCEPTIONALLY WELL	NO RESPONSE	MEAN	SD
0	0	5.9	23.5	29.4	41.2	0	0	5.1	1.0

20. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE THIS INSTRUCTOR AS A PERSON.

DISLIKED INTENSELY	DISLIKED CONSIDERABLY	DISLIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED SOMEWHAT	LIKED A LOT	LIKED VERY MUCH	LIKED EXCEPTIONALLY WELL	NO RESPONSE	MEAN	SD
0	0	0	11.8	29.4	35.3	17.6	5.9	5.6	1.0

21. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THIS INSTRUCTORS OVERALL TEACHING ABILITY.

VERY POOR	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT	EXCEPTIONALLY GOOD	NO RESPONSE	MEAN	SD
0	0	5.9	17.6	35.3	5.3	5.9	0	5.2	1.0

22. HOW MUCH WOULD YOU SAY YOU LEARNED FROM THIS INSTRUCTOR.

ALMOST NOTHING	VERY LITTLE	LITTLE	A FAIR AMOUNT	MUCH	VERY MUCH	AN EXCEPTIONAL AMOUNT	NO RESPONSE	MEAN	SD
0	0	0	23.5	47.1	29.4	0	0	5.1	.7

23. HOW MUCH EFFORT DID YOU PUT INTO THIS COURSE.

ALMOST NONE	VERY LITTLE	LITTLE	A FAIR AMOUNT	MUCH	VERY MUCH	AN EXCEPTIONAL AMOUNT	NO RESPONSE	MEAN	SD
0	0	0	35.3	29.4	35.3	0	0	5.0	.9

24. IN WHICH YEAR IN SCHOOL ARE YOU.

FRESHMAN	SOPHOMORE	JUNIOR	SENIOR	GRADUATE	ADULT SPECIAL	NO RESPONSE
0	0	0	0	17.6	76.5	5.9

25. WAS THIS SPECIFIC COURSE REQUIRED OF YOU.

YES	NO	NO RESPONSE
5.9	94.1	0

26. WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL CUMULATIVE GRADE-POINT AVERAGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

2.0 OR BELOW	2.1-2.5	2.6-3.0	3.1-3.5	3.6-4.0	NO RESPONSE
5.9	0	0	17.6	17.6	58.8

27. WHICH SEX ARE YOU.

FEMALE	MALE	NO RESPONSE
5.9	82.4	11.8

Appendix F

Studeni Evaluation Form

Student Evaluation Form - Additional Information

VoEd 5-100 Special Topics of Instruction - Special Needs

1. How will this course help you next school year in your job?

2. What modules and inservice experiences were of value to you?

3. What new modules or inservice experiences would you include for future course offerings?

4. What activities or experiences were of little or no value to you?

5. List new procedures and techniques you were exposed to that will help you in your job situation.

6. List 5 strengths of this course.

7. List 5 weaknesses of this course.

8. List your suggestions for improvement of the handbook.

9. Give your reaction to the team teaching approach used in the class.

10. Additional comments:

Appendix G

Responses To Student Evaluation Form

Summer, 1977 Course

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM--ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

VoEd 5100--Special Topics of Instruction--Special Needs

1. HOW WILL THIS COURSE HELP YOU NEXT SCHOOL YEAR IN YOUR JOB?

It will help me to organize the program and help me find out more about the special needs students.

Establish special help for students, to supplement their regular curriculum. Give me a reference of people to help these students. Provide direction to follow for establishing special help for students.

Will help me to evaluate my work with slow learners that I may have in my class.

I will be able to evaluate teaching methods and determine which methods will work best for a particular student.

My paper for the course will provide me with an additional tool which is presently lacking in the program.

Identify special needs learners. Refer special needs learners. Development of plans for special needs learners.

It should be of great benefit to me in a new position of adult instructor-coordinator at the Red Wing AVTI for special needs.

It will help me to better understand the WED and the WEH programs at my school. It also will help me to work with my own WED students.

I feel as if I have the basic tools to help a special needs student in my class reach her maximum potential. I am aware of resource personnel and services for additional help and advice.

The course helped me clarify some ideas on evaluation and instructional modifications.

Not next year unless I use it in a practicum setting, but eventually it will be a good tool for setting up training programs at a workshop or related facility.

Helps me to be much more aware of special needs learners and their needs of different ways of learning.

Full-time student at U of M--N/A.

Since at this time I do not have a teaching job, I do not know.

Provide me with certification and a raise.

Uncertain. It has provided some good foundational information for alternative education.

I will work more closely with special ed people if I have a student of theirs in class.

The course is a beginning for me (no previous exposure to special needs area).

This course has increased my understanding of special needs learners. It will enable me to be of greater help to them and take them into consideration in planning my teaching.

I will be using several inservice experiences in my work program.

2. WHAT MODULES AND INSERVICE EXPERIENCE WERE OF VALUE TO YOU?

Module 1: Learner Identification and Analysis (10)

Module 2: Cooperative Instructional Arrangements (4)

Module 3: Instructional Resources (5)

Module 4: Cluster and Content Analysis (4)

Module 5: Instructional Planning (9)

Module 6: Instructional Implementation (4)

Module 7: Evaluation of Learner Progress (5)

All (5)

3. WHAT NEW MODULES OR INSERVICE EXPERIENCE WOULD YOU INCLUDE FOR FUTURE COURSE OFFERINGS?

Specific planning in areas of reading and math, specific in finding out what areas a student needs help in.

I feel it would be easier to follow through the course with a particular student. Not changing, rather approaching it differently.

Possibly using a "model student" example and set up the entire series of modules focusing on him/her. Possibly featured in a film, etc.--if student does not have special need cases already.

A section on some specific counseling techniques, such as TET, Reality Therapy, etc.

I would recommend doing them all and having videotapes of students to work with (different special needs).

Module on practical experiences--visitation and reports.

How to interpret scores on cumulative files.

Legal implications of working with special needs students.

4. WHAT ACTIVITIES OR EXPERIENCES WERE OF LITTLE OR NO VALUE TO YOU?

A-1 were useful. (5)

Module 4: Cluster and Content Analysis

Going over many pages of assignment reading material during class hours using overhead projector. (3)

Module 2: Cooperative Instructional Arrangements

Module 7: Evaluation of Learner Progress

5. LIST NEW PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES YOU WERE EXPOSED TO THAT WILL HELP YOU IN YOUR JOB SITUATION.

Finding out strengths and weaknesses of a student.

Identifying special needs students. Types of people to approach for help.

The identifying, prescribing and planning aspects of the class will help me to be better organized in the future.

Learned about the services of MIMC.

Use of various forms. (6)

Experiences of other special needs coordinators.

The forms in the handbook will give me new procedures on how to organize my own program.

Behavior modification was a very interesting one. I think this technique is most helpful in working with special needs learners.

A better understanding of special needs students. (5)

6. LIST 5 STRENGTHS OF THIS COURSE.

Speakers (15)

Resources (10)

Group discussion (9)

Well organized (4)

Inservice experience (4)

Text--materials written out (8)

Informal atmosphere (3)

Student participation (2)

Variety of media presentations (2)

Information (2)

Interesting (2)

Learning modules

Assignments

Selection of alternative activities

7. LIST 5 WEAKNESSES OF THIS COURSE.

Two weeks is not long enough for this course. (11)

Not enough time spent in inservice experiences. (5)

No active involvement with special needs students. (3)

Do not read handbook--offer supplemental instruction. (5)

Guidelines for what was expected of students were not clear. (3)

Need more discussion time.

No outline of day-to-day topics covered.

Text too expensive.

No coffee available close by.

Exposure to maintenance crews.

8. LIST YOUR SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE HANDBOOK

Additional copies of experiences. (5)

One case study or a selection of case studies that would follow through all modules would lend continuity to the use of all or most modules to help a particular student.

Include loose leaf notebook cover. Additional work sheet pages. (4)

Update to include PL Handicapped Law and Minnesota Student Rights & Privacy Laws.

Put two sheets or forms for each inservice experience. (3)

I think if it were subdivided and handed out in a loose leaf binder it would last longer for some people.

Handbook should be burned.

Use colored paper in workbooks.

9. GIVE YOUR REACTION TO THE TEAM TEACHING APPROACH USED IN THE CLASS.

Very good--each person had different experiences to relate to. Much more variety. (12)

Excellent. (5)

Team teaching over short period (2 weeks) lost some of the logical sequence of the course.

All team members easily approachable for assistance and willing to help. I like the team teaching approach--I felt comfortable--friendly atmosphere.

10. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

I wondered if the needs survey altered the structure and focus of the class presentation? I strongly feel that a mock case study should be developed as an information source for each class member. Then everyone can participate in discussion after an inservice is done for practice. Then each class member could use an actual

student of theirs to help that individual. Offer course during school year. This class is a good foundation to build from.

Procedures and content were of a very practical and useful nature.

Excellent course. Should be required of all vocational teachers, as well as work experience coordinators. A fine job, well done.

The course could be more meaningful to students if it were offered during the regular school year in which a student would have 10 weeks in making out the inservice experiences with more realistic figures.

Appendix H

Responses To Student Evaluation Form

Winter, 1978 Course

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

VoEd 5100 - Special Topics of Instruction - Special Needs

1. HOW WILL THIS COURSE HELP YOU NEXT SCHOOL YEAR IN YOUR JOB?

I think so. I plan to make several recommendations as a result of it.

More understanding of special needs students.

Working at a private school, I really don't think it will be of much help - other than opening my eyes.

It will help me better understand why some students are not doing as well as they should.

Better prepared to change teaching ways to relate to special needs students.

Hope it will help me solve some of my problems with my deaf students. Made me more aware of some of my own shortcomings as well as paying more attention to each individual's needs.

I developed a "change plan" that should provide a starting point and guide if I should get students that need it.

Very much.

This course will help in test writing.

Text evaluation and student reading evaluation. Better overall attention of special needs.

Yes: Help me to better understand my special need student and to give him help in the area he is weak in.

I am better organized now and have already initiated my change plan to increase student learning.

Help me determine the readability of my textbooks. Intend on using the Cloze test on students who are experiencing difficulty.

Reference. Help to understand other personal positions or responsibilities.

a.) More aware - of the special needs people and the available help which can be found in the school and area to help these people.

b.) Using the various "helps" it will make the job of working with special needs easier.

Help me to determine employability of the student more specifically.

?????

2. WHAT MODULES AND INSERVICE EXPERIENCE WERE OF VALUE TO YOU?

IEP especially. I plan to use it.

Vocabulary tests, Cloze test, Fry test.

Vocabulary tests and Cloze tests.

The ones that explained new procedures.

Most all except module 7.

Module 6 was of use to me (FOG).

All of them, especially understanding the reading level of my tests and lectures.

Task Inventory.

Module 1 and 6.

Different ways of experiencing the value of special needs.

The ones that helped identify problems.

FOG Readability Resources.

All to same degree "Review".

Reading levels, vocabulary.

Reading Level - will be used by me each time I write for my students or analyze a book for their use.

Adapting reading materials.

3. WHAT NEW MODULES OR INSERVICE EXPERIENCE WOULD YOU INCLUDE FOR FUTURE COURSE OFFERINGS?

I will include more handouts.

More hands-on teaching, show how something is done and getting the student the skills to do it.

Getting a change plan into action.

A) Methods of testing for special needs - deaf - or slow learners.

B) Fill out and discuss more of the modules in the class.

Ideas on how to teach the basic reading skills in vocational courses.

4. WHAT ACTIVITIES OR EXPERIENCES WERE OF LITTLE OR NO VALUE TO YOU?

Those items that did not pertain to private Vocational Schools.

Mainstreaming beginning at the bottom level.

All of some value. Module 7 - doubtful have time to do or check out.

Module I because this school has others that do this work.

To me they were all of good value.

Role playing of a special needs advisory committee.

None.

Follow-up and evaluation. Cluster and Content Analysis.

One module done in class. Not enough preparation time, total confusion.

Follow-up surveys for my students. Behavior modification activities - didn't offer enough alternatives to achieve behavior changes in my situation.

5. LIST NEW PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES YOU WERE EXPOSED TO THAT WILL HELP YOU IN YOUR JOB SITUATION.

Cloze Tests, Fry Tests.

Many new procedures were explained. Experience will dictate how helpful.

FOG.

Again the ones that were directly related to the classroom.

Instruction, pre-assessments, formative assessments.

Fog and Cloze Tests.

Having the tasks of the basic area and putting it to work.

Vocabulary testing, Cloze test, Fry readability test.

Vocabulary test, Fog Readability, Readability charts and graphs, Resources available.

1) Identify special needs.
2) Help available to special needs in school etc.
3) Methods of dealing with the various special needs people said can be encountered.

Fry Reading Test.

6. LIST FIVE STRENGTHS OF THIS COURSE

Made me aware of things I wasn't familiar with in Vocational Education; changed my personal definition of special needs students. May have been the most helpful accreditation class I've had.

Closer look at special needs.
What to do with Special Needs Students.
Where to look for help.
How to go about getting help both in funding and instruction.

1) Openness of the instructors.
2) Making me see that "Special Needs" People exist and deserve help.

Instructors.

Content.

Teaching methods.
Enthusiasm of instructors.

Made me aware of special needs
Made me understand a workable system.
Made me understand how to implement.
Made me understand how to get help to accomplish.
Gave me a better understanding of my shortcomings.

course content.
time of class.
location of class.
instructor.

able to express my opinions.

All were very good.

Identification of special needs.
Personal involvement into modules.
Makes us think that we are into teaching to help the students.
Scheduling of class time.
Location of course.

Values.
Knowing your needs.

Team work. Role Playing.
Good Text. Student input (Discussions) 2 hour time blocks.

Interesting.
Informative.

Requirements were specifically outlined. We had a choice of activities so we could profit and use what we learned.

Textbook.
Information on special needs legislation.
Guest speaker.
Small group activities.

7. LIST FIVE WEAKNESSES OF THIS COURSE.

Not relevant to all teaching situations. I HATE role playing.

Textbook.

The subject matter is to great to cover in 10 meetings.

Great amount of material to cover.

Not enough explanation of what we were working on.
More explanation of how to do.

Slowness of subject matter delivery.

To me there was no real weakness.

Noise coming over loud speakers during class.

Not have the experiences in what to do for the special need student.
Generalizing the subject to cover all areas of education.

Aimed for special aid students at too low a level.

Should have been more direction given before some of the activities.

Need for more feedback on group activities.

During the activity on individualized plans some students needed more information on how to write I.E.P.'s.

8. LIST YOUR SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE HANDBOOK.

You'll never come up with one that's perfect for all situations. This was one of the better I've seen for accreditation courses.

I found it rather hard to follow and understand. I can't understand why we can't cut the excess words and get to the point. Keep it simple.

Number system for chapters, etc.

Round file. Hard to follow - confusing at times. Is special needs going to be another paperwork nightmare?

More group work if it is better organized.

None.

Mark the inservice activities (sheets) with colored paper and make all the others white.

One of the better textbooks I have used in our Adult Special.

The numbering system is hard to work with.

Make pages easier to remove for duplicating.

9. GIVE YOUR REACTION TO THE TEAM TEACHING APPROACH USED IN THE CLASS.

It did vary the presentation. Would prefer this over single teacher method.

I like this type of teaching method. It keeps you more interested in subject.

Simply stated, I liked it. If for nothing else, variety.

This was my first contact with team teaching and I hope to have much more.

Enjoyable, much more thinking and time employed in class makeup.

Quite good.

It seemed to divide the material a little too much sometimes, a little hard to relate the information-on the other hand it was very refreshing to have different presentations and different points of view.

I enjoy working as a team.

Well organized.

Made it more interesting.

This gave a variety of input or approach.

Immaterial.

It was good as a variety of opinions were brought forth by the instructors.

Good, provided several points of view.

Nice.

Appendix I

Impact Questionnaire Form

Name_____ Date_____

Part A.

1. What is your current position?_____
(Job Title)

2. In this position, how many special needs students have you had contact with this school year?

_____
(Number)

3. Who identified these special needs students? (Check all that apply.)

___ a. Myself
___ b. Counselor
___ c. Other Teacher
___ d. Coordinator
___ e. Parents
___ f. Student
___ g. Administrator
___ h. Other_____
(Specify)

Part B. The following series of questions relate to selected topics of the course content.

1. Learner Identification and Development of a Learner Profile and Prescription.

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support
_____
(Specify)

No___

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____
(Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

2. Developing Cooperative Instructional Arrangements

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___ No___

Do You feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

3. Developing a Special Needs Resource Inventory

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___ No___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too

4. Development of a Special Needs Advisory Committee

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No___

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

5. Identifying and Analyzing Career Clusters

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No___

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

6. Developing and Sequencing Instructional Modules

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Students
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No___

Why not? (What were the barriers

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

7. Analyzing Instructional Materials

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No___

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

8. Providing Reinforcement and Feedback

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No___

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

9. Modifying the Learning Enviornment

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support

_____ (Specify)

No ___

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

10. Monitoring and Evaluating Student Progress

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support
___ _____ (Specify)

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

11. Conducting a Learner Follow-Up Survey

a) Have you implemented these concepts in your program?

Yes___

Do you feel this helped your program?

Yes___

Who did it help?

___ Parents
___ Student
___ Myself
___ Other School Personnel

No___

Why not?

___ Insufficient Time
___ Insufficient Funds
___ Insufficient Student Response
___ Insufficient Support
___ _____ (Specify)

No___

Why not? (What were the barriers?)

___ 1. No Need
___ 2. Lack of Information
___ 3. Already Implemented
___ 4. School Personnel
___ 5. Money
___ 6. Time
___ 7. Other_____ (Specify)

b) How would you rate the course emphasis on this topical area? (circle one)

Too Little Appropriate Too Much

Part C.

1. Indicate how this course helped you in working with the following groups: (circle one)

	Helped a Great Deal	Helped Some	Did Not Help
Special Needs Students			
Other Students			
Parents			
Administrators			
Counselors			
Special Needs Staff			
Remedial Staff			
Other Teachers			
Other_____ (Specify)			

2. What do you feel were voids in this course?

3. What suggestions do you have to help us improve this course?

4. Rate your change in attitude toward working with special needs students as a result of this course. (circle one)

Highly Negative	Somewhat Negative	No Change	Somewhat Positive	Highly Positive

Please describe these changes.

5. What further training do you need in the area of Vocational Special Needs?